

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has received the Office Action dated March 20, 2008, in which the Examiner: 1) rejected claims 5-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter; 2) rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, as being allegedly indefinite; 3) rejected claims 1-4, 9, 11-12, 14, 16-17 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Malik (U.S. Pat. No. 5,832,503); 4) rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Malik in view of Merchant (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0128815); 5) rejected claims 10, 13, 15 and 18-19 as obvious over Malik in view of “Official Notice”; and 6) allowed claims 5-7. With this Response, Applicant has amended claims 1, 5 and 16.

I. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner stated that “[c]claims 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101,” but only specifically discussed claim 8. Office Action p. 2. Thus, it is not clear whether the Examiner intended to reject claims 5-7 under § 101. Clarification is respectfully requested.

Claim 1 is an independent claim that the Examiner did NOT reject under § 101. The Examiner thus clearly conceded that claim 1 IS directed to statutory subject matter. Claims 5-8 depend from claim 1 and thus inherit all of the limitations of claim 1. Moreover, because the Examiner has concluded that claim 1 complies with § 101, the Examiner must also concede that all claims dependent on claim 1 also comply with § 101. Applicant respectfully reminds the Examiner that a § 101 analysis must focus on the claimed invention as a whole, MPEP §§ 2106 and 2106.01, and that dependent claims 5-8 contain all of the limitations of claim 1.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2ND PARAGRAPH

The Examiner made several comments in the § 112(2) rejections (Office Action, p. 2) which Applicant now addresses. The Examiner first alleged that, with regard to claim 1, the “relationship among ‘parameters,’ ‘generic commands’ and ‘device-specific commands’ has not been clearly explained and defined.” Applicant is unsure why the Examiner finds the relationship to be unclear.

Claim 1 clearly explains that there generic commands are converted into device-specific commands that are applied to individual network devices. Claim 1 also clearly explains that the devices are configured by issuing generic commands to the library (which stores such generic commands) and in accordance with the configuration parameters. Applicant believes one of ordinary skill in the art would find claim 1 to be very clear and at least sufficiently clear to comply with § 112(2). Applicant needs clarification from the Examiner as to why it is believed the claim is not clear enough. Without that understanding, it is difficult for Applicant to further address the Examiner's concerns.

The Examiner also noted that claim 1 does not require a generic command to be converted to a device-specific command. Even if this is an accurate interpretation of the claim, Applicant fails to understand why that means claim 1 does not comply with the clarity requirement of § 112(2). Applicant, however, has amended claim 1 to specify that the configuration of the devices uses the device-specific commands in accordance with the configuration parameters.

III. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner concluded that dependent claims 5-7 contain allowable subject matter. Applicant has amended claim 1 to include some of the limitations of claim 5. Specifically, Applicant has amended claim 1 to specify that "wherein said configuration interface displays identifications of firewall devices associated with a network and conduits within said firewall devices, and permits a user to select at least one of said firewall devices." Applicant does not find this limitation in the art of record and believes that the Examiner would agree based on the indication of allowability of claim 5.

Applicant also amended claim 16 to require "displaying a plurality of firewall devices and a conduit for each such firewall device." For a similar as articulated above regarding claim 1, Applicant believes that claim 16 and its dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

IV. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 8, 10, 13, 15 and 18-19 are allowable for the reasons provided above in section III.

**Appl. No. 09/843,815
Amdt. dated May 30, 2008
Reply to Office Action of March 20, 2008**

V. CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jonathan M. Harris/
Jonathan M. Harris
PTO Reg. No. 44,144
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400